| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12 | BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP RICHARD J. POCKER (NV Bar No. 3568) 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 800 Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: 702.382.7300 Facsimile: 702.382.2755 rpocker@bsfllp.com  BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP WILLIAM ISAACSON (pro hac vice) KAREN DUNN (pro hac vice) 5301 Wisconsin Ave, NW Washington, DC 20015 Telephone: 202.237.2727 Facsimile: 202.237.6131 wisaacson@bsfllp.com kdunn@bsfllp.com  BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (pro hac vice) KIERAN P. RINGGENBERG (pro hac vice) 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: 510.874.1000 | MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP THOMAS S. HIXSON (pro hac vice) KRISTEN A. PALUMBO (pro hac vice) One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105 Telephone: 415.442.1000 Facsimile: 415.442.1001 thomas.hixson@morganlewis.com kristen.palumbo@morganlewis.com  DORIAN DALEY (pro hac vice) DEBORAH K. MILLER (pro hac vice) JAMES C. MAROULIS (pro hac vice) ORACLE CORPORATION 500 Oracle Parkway, M/S 50p7 Redwood City, CA 94070 Telephone: 650.506.4846 Facsimile: 650.506.7114 dorian.daley@oracle.com deborah.miller@oracle.com jim.maroulis@oracle.com |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| 13  | Facsimile: 510.874.1460  |  |  |
| 14  | sholtzman@bsfllp.com<br>kringgenberg@bsfllp.com  |  |  |
| 15<br>16  | Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International Corp.  |  |  |
| 17  | UNITED STATES D  | DISTRICT COURT   |  |
| 18  | DISTRICT OF NEVADA   |  |  |
| 19  |  |  |  |
| 20  | ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;<br>ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware  | Case No 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL   |  |
| 21  | corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, a California corporation,   | DECLARATION OF THOMAS S.<br>HIXSON IN SUPPORT OF ORACLE'S<br>MOTION FOR COSTS AND  |  |
| 22  | Plaintiffs,  | ATTORNEYS' FEES  |  |
| 23  | V.   | REDACTED PUBLIC VERSION  |  |
| 24  | RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation; SETH RAVIN, an individual,  |  |  |
| 25  | Defendants.  |  |  |
| 26  |  |  |  |
| 27  |  |  |  |
| 28  |  |  |  |
| <b>4</b> 0  |  |  |  |

| 1  | I, Thomas S. Hixson, declare as follows:  |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  | 1. I am an attorney admitted to practice law in the State of California and before the            |  |
| 3  | Court in this action pro hac vice. I am a partner with the law firm Morgan, Lewis and Bockius     |  |
| 4  | LLP ("Morgan Lewis"), counsel of record for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc.,    |  |
| 5  | and Oracle International Corporation (together, "Oracle" or "Plaintiffs"). I submit this          |  |
| 6  | declaration in support of Oracle's motion for attorneys' fees and expenses in the above-captioned |  |
| 7  | lawsuit. The facts stated herein are based on my personal knowledge or on information provided    |  |
| 8  | to me by attorneys working under my direction.  |  |
| 9  | 2. At the inception of this case, the Morgan Lewis attorneys were employed by                     |  |
| 10 | Bingham McCutchen LLP ("Bingham"), where I was a partner, and which was counsel of record         |  |
| 11 | for Oracle. Bingham's work on this case for Oracle began in 2008. In November 2014, the           |  |
| 12 | Bingham attorneys working on this case joined Morgan Lewis.                                       |  |
| 13 | Bingham & Morgan Lewis Fees and Billing Practices   |  |
| 14 | 3. Exhibit 1 is a summary and breakdown of the total amount of Oracle's fees and                  |  |
| 15 | costs incurred in this case, including those paid to Bingham, Morgan Lewis, Boies, Schiller and   |  |
| 16 | Flexner LLP ("Boies Schiller"), and to other firms and companies.                                 |  |
| 17 | 4. As mentioned above, attorneys at my firm began working on this case at its                     |  |
| 18 | inception in 2008. All of Morgan Lewis's bills and Bingham's bills for December 2008 through      |  |
| 19 | September 2015 for Morgan Lewis's and Bingham's work on this matter are attached as Exhibits      |  |
| 20 | 3-9. Time entries for which Oracle does not seek recovery have been redacted from these           |  |
| 21 | invoices.   |  |
| 22 | 5. As detailed in Exhibit 2, the attorneys and legal support staff at Bingham and                 |  |
| 23 | Morgan Lewis have billed 40,642 hours on this case. Exhibit 2 also details the number of          |  |
| 24 | unredacted hours that each person billed, along with the dollar amounts billed for those hours.   |  |
| 25 | 6.  |  |
| 26 |   |  |
| 27 | 7. The summaries in Exhibits 1 and 2 do not include amounts that were paid and                    |  |
| 28 | invoiced for block-billed entries where all or part of the description of the work needed to be   |  |

1 redacted due to privilege or other reasons. The total billed amount for the block-billed entries 2 that were redacted is \$4,767,863.22. 3 8. Oracle paid the amounts due for all bills attached as Exhibits 3-9, for the amounts 4 described in those bills and summarized in Exhibits 1 and 2, except for the September 2015 bill, 5 which is in process for payment. 6 9. From 2008 until 2014, Bingham established a rate schedule listing the standard 7 hourly billing rate for each attorney and legal assistant each December that would be used in the 8 following calendar year. After we joined Morgan Lewis in 2014, the standard 2015 rates took 9 effect in March 2015 rather than January. 10 10. 11 12 13 14 11. Morgan Lewis, and Bingham before it, have represented Oracle in a variety of 15 matters for more than a decade. 16 12. **17** 18 19 20 13. 21 22 23 24 14. Oracle's in-house counsel have been directly involved in this matter since its 25 inception. They have supervised our work and reviewed our bills, and have often asked **26** questions about our bills. In some instances they have asked that we write off time spent on 27 certain tasks. Those write-offs are reflected in Exhibits and 1 and 2, and in our invoices attached 28 as Exhibits 3-9.

| 1  | 15. In preparing this fee application, I have reviewed the billing records for this case,           |
|----|---|
| 2  | and I obtained the further assistance of other lawyers on the team to review them. All              |
| 3  | timekeepers track their time by the day to the nearest tenth of an hour. Many tasks in significant  |
| 4  | litigation such as this action require multiple attorneys to complete, as they are complex or need  |
| 5  | to work at different levels or time intervals. Given the complicated nature of the case, and its    |
| 6  | size and scope, as well as Defendants' conduct, the time billed by Bingham's and Morgan             |
| 7  | Lewis's attorneys and staff on this matter was reasonable.  |
| 8  | 16. In a case involving similar legal claims and of similar complexity, <i>Oracle USA</i> ,         |
| 9  | Inc. v. SAP AG, N.D. Cal., Case No. 07-CV-1658, the parties reached an agreement which              |
| 10 | provided that the defendants pay Oracle's attorneys' fees in the sum of \$120 million. Oracle was   |
| 11 | represented by Bingham and Boies Schiller in that case and was charged similar rates to those       |
| 12 | charged for this case for the years in question.  |
| 13 | Efforts Taken During The Litigation Due To Rimini's Litigation Conduct                              |
| 14 | 17. The manner in which Rimini litigated this case significantly increased Oracle's                 |
| 15 | litigation expenses. Rimini's misrepresentations regarding cross-use, its misrepresentations        |
| 16 | regarding its use of Siebel and JD Edwards software, spoliation of evidence, and its repeated       |
| 17 | failure to produce timely and accurate discovery responses, and other conduct, resulted in Oracle   |
| 18 | expending significantly more on attorney and expert fees to prove its case. For example,            |
| 19 | Rimini's spoliation and misrepresentations required significant additional effort to search for and |
| 20 | analyze emails and other anecdotal evidence to establish how Rimini actually used Oracle's          |
| 21 | software in its support process.  |
| 22 | 18. On July 11, 2011, Rimini served its Responses to Oracle's Interrogatories                       |
| 23 | Numbers 20-22. On September 8, 2011, Rimini served its Supplemental Response to Oracle's            |
| 24 | Interrogatories Numbers 20-22. On December 19, 2011, Rimini served its Second Supplemental          |
| 25 | Response to Oracle's Interrogatories Numbers 20-22. On February 5, 2012, Rimini served              |
| 26 | updated exhibits to its Responses to Oracle's Interrogatories Number 20 and 22. On February 5,      |
| 27 | 2012, Rimini served an updated exhibit to its Response to Oracle's Interrogatory Number 20.         |
| 28 | With each iteration, Rimini updated the lists of software environments residing on its systems      |

- 1 that were listed in Rimini's responses.
- 2 19. Attached as Exhibit 10 is an August 17, 2011 email from my colleague, John
- 3 Polito, to Rimini's counsel identifying additional PeopleSoft software environments that were
- 4 not included in Rimini's interrogatory responses.
- 5 20. Attached as Exhibit 11 is a November 1, 2011 email from Mr. Polito to Rimini's
- 6 counsel identifying discrepancies in Rimini's list of Siebel software environments included in
- 7 Rimini's interrogatory responses.
- 8 21. Attached as Exhibit 12 is a December 2, 2011 letter from Mr. Polito to Rimini's
- 9 counsel identifying additional discrepancies in the list of software environments included in
- 10 Rimini's interrogatory responses.
- 11 22. As of the date that this declaration was executed, Oracle has not yet received a
- 12 complete customer list, list of environments, list of fixes, or list of downloads from Rimini
- pursuant to the interrogatories that Oracle served on July 20, 2015 in *Rimini Street, Inc. v. Oracle*
- 14 International Corp., Case No. 2:14-cv-01699 LRH PAL (D. Nev.) ("Rimini II"). Rimini
- produced a customer list to Oracle on November 2, 201, but only after Oracle threatened to seek
- 16 Court intervention, and that list was missing over 100 customers. Oracle has had to spend
- dozens of hours compiling information from other sources to determine which customers Rimini
- **18** failed to include.
- 19 23. Rimini assured Oracle in July 2015 that it would be able to produce information
- in the *Rimini II* action from the various databases it uses in its provision of support services, but
- 21 then later said it could not do so until the end of 2015.
- 22 Scope of Litigation
- 23 24. Bingham's work on this case began with pre-suit investigation by legal counsel in
- 24 late 2008. The complaint was filed in January 2010, and the jury trial did not conclude until
- 25 October 2015.
- 26 25. This case involved complex and difficult legal issues which required experienced
- 27 lawyers and law firms with vast resources.
- 28 26. Based on my review of the docket, the parties filed over 45 motions in this case.

| 1         | In total, the docket in this case has over 900 entries.  |
|-----------|--|
| 2         | 27. Rimini served 57 requests for production on Oracle. In response, Oracle                                |
| 3         | produced approximately 270,000 documents totaling over 1.3 million pages. Altogether, over 12              |
| 4         | million pages of documents were produced in this litigation by Oracle, Rimini, and third parties.          |
| 5         | 28. Over the course of this case, hundreds of meet and confer letters and emails were                      |
| 6         | exchanged between the parties.   |
| 7         | 29. There were a total of 67 depositions taken in this case.   |
| 8         | Bingham & Morgan Lewis Case Teams  |
| 9         | 30. I graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School in 1997 where I was an                             |
| 10        | editor for the <i>Harvard Law Review</i> , and <i>magna cum laude</i> from Harvard University in 1994 with |
| 11        | an A.B. in Government. After law school, I clerked for the Honorable A. Wallace Tashima of                 |
| 12        | the U.S. Court of Appeals Ninth Circuit from 1997 to 1998. I became a partner at Bingham                   |
| 13        | effective January 1, 2005 and continued as a partner when I joined Morgan Lewis. My practice               |
| 14        | concentrates on complex intellectual property and antitrust matters. Throughout my career, I               |
| 15        | have represented both plaintiffs and defendants in commercial disputes in courts and arbitrations          |
| 16        | around the country. I was named a Super Lawyer in Northern California. My recent                           |
| <b>17</b> | representations have included Oracle America, Inc., et al. v. Terix Computer Company, Inc., et             |
| 18        | al., San Diego County Water Authority v. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, et            |
| 19        | al., Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al.  |
| 20        | 31. I began working on this case near its inception. Since then, I have helped develop                     |
| 21        | and execute the team's litigation strategy. I have written numerous motions and taken and                  |
| 22        | defended several depositions. As trial counsel, I collaboratively prepared our trial strategy and          |
| 23        | execution plans, drafted witness examinations, prepared witnesses, conducted an examination,               |
| 24        | and drafted pre- and post-trial motions and other filings, among other tasks. A summary of the             |
| 25        | time I have spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached             |
| 26        | hereto. My hourly rates were as follows:   |
| 27        |  |

28

| 1  |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 2  |   |   |
| 3  |   |   |
| 4  |   |   |
| 5  |   |   |
| 6  | The following paragraphs identify and describe the other Bingham and Morgan                       |   |
| 7  | Lewis lawyers and staff on the case team, with highlights of their backgrounds and experience.    |   |
| 8  | The information regarding other timekeepers on the team is within my personal knowledge as to     | ) |
| 9  | matters we worked on together and rests upon my inquiry and belief as to other details.           |   |
| 10 | 33. <b>Geoffrey M. Howard</b> is former a partner at Bingham and then Morgan Lewis in             |   |
| 11 | the San Francisco office. Mr. Howard graduated cum laude with a J.D. from Harvard Law             |   |
| 12 | School in 1991 and <i>magna cum laude</i> with a B.A. in Political Science from the University of |   |
| 13 | California, Los Angeles. Mr. Howard was named <i>The Recorder</i> 2010 Attorney of the Year, the  |   |
| 14 | California Lawyer California Lawyer of the Year, a Top 100 Lawyer by the Daily Journal, and       | a |
| 15 | Leading Lawyer in IP by Chambers USA among his accolades. Mr. Howard's previous                   |   |
| 16 | representations include Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. in which Oracle won a jury       |   |
| 17 | verdict of \$1.3 billion. Mr. Howard began working on this case from its inception at the end of  |   |
| 18 | 2008. A summary of the time Mr. Howard spent on this matter and the value of that work is         |   |
| 19 | contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Howard's hourly rates were as follows:                |   |
| 20 | •   |   |
| 21 | •   |   |
| 22 | •   |   |
| 23 | •   |   |
| 24 | •   |   |
| 25 | •   |   |
| 26 | •   |   |
| 27 | •   |   |
| 28 | 34. <b>Kristen A. Palumbo</b> is a partner at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office.           |   |

6

- 1 Ms. Palumbo graduated magna cum laude with a J.D. from the University of San Francisco
- 2 School of Law in 2001 and with a B.A. from Boston College in 1995. Ms. Palumbo focuses her
- 3 litigation practice on antitrust, class action defense, and other high-stakes complex commercial
- 4 litigation, including breach of contract, fraud, unfair competition, and copyright matters. Ms.
- 5 Palumbo has experience in all phases of litigation, including pre-filing investigations, discovery,
- 6 motion practice, settlement, and trial, and she has worked extensively with experts. Ms.
- 7 Palumbo also advises clients in the criminal context in connection with governmental antitrust
- 8 investigations. Ms. Palumbo was named a Super Lawyer in Northern California. More details
- 9 about Ms. Palumbo's background and practice can be found at

20

- 10 <a href="http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/kristenpalumbo">http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/kristenpalumbo</a>. Ms. Palumbo began working on this case in
- 11 2009. A summary of the time Ms. Palumbo spent on this matter and the value of that work is
- 12 contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Palumbo's hourly rates were as follows:



35. **John Polito** is partner at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. He

- 21 graduated with a J.D. from Stanford Law School. He also graduated with a B.A. in Mathematics
- with Honors and a B.A. in Music with Honors from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Mr.
- 23 Polito was named by the *Daily Journal* as an "Associate to Watch" and one of California's Top
- 24 20 Under 40 Lawyers in 2014. He was also named by Super Lawyers as a Northern California
- 25 Rising Star in 2013 to 2015. Before becoming a lawyer, Mr. Polito had a career as a software
- engineer. Mr. Polito's representations have included Amazon.com, Inc. et al. v. Commissioner,
- 27 Blackberry Ltd. et al. v. Cypress Semiconductor Corp., and Oracle USA, Inc. v. SAP AG et al.
- More details about Mr. Polito's background and practice can be found at

1 http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/johnpolito. Mr. Polito began working on this case in 2009. A 2 summary of the time Mr. Polito spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in 3 Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Polito's hourly rates were as follows: 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 36. **Bree Hann** is a former partner at Bingham in the San Francisco office. Ms. 12 Hann graduated Order of the Coif with a J.D. from the University of California, Berkeley 13 School of Law in 2001 where she was on the California Law Review. Ms. Hann graduated with **14** a B.A. in English from the University of Southern California in 1998. Ms. Hann clerked for the 15 Honorable Lewis A. Kaplan of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New 16 York. Ms. Hann's practice focused on intellectual property and antitrust litigation and **17** counseling, class action defense, and other complex commercial litigation matters. Ms. Hann 18 began working on this case in 2009. A summary of the time Ms. Hann spent on this matter and 19 the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Hann's hourly rates were as 20 follows: 21 22 23 24 25 **26** 27 37. **David O. Johanson** is a senior counsel at Morgan Lewis, and was previously a 28 partner at Bingham, in the Boston office. Mr. Johanson graduated cum laude with a J.D. from

1 Harvard Law School in 1976 and *summa cum laude* with a B.A. from Yale University in 1972. 2 Mr. Johanson's practice concentrates on commercial technology, product development and 3 distribution, trademarks, copyrights, trade secrets, and licensing. More details about Mr. 4 Johanson's background and practice can be found at 5 http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/davidjohanson. Mr. Johanson was named as a Super Lawyer 6 in 2004-2005. Mr. Johanson began working on this case in 2009. A summary of the time Mr. 7 Johanson spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached 8 hereto. Mr. Johanson's hourly rates were as follows: 9 10 11 12 38. **Zachary J. Alinder** is a former partner at Bingham in the San Francisco office. 13 Mr. Alinder graduated with a J.D. from the University of California, Berkeley School of Law in 14 2000 and with a B.S. from Stanford University in 1995. Mr. Alinder also has a M.S. in 15 Environmental Engineering from Stanford University. Mr. Alinder's previous representations 16 included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. A summary of the time Mr. Alinder spent on **17** this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Alinder's 18 hourly rates were as follows: 19 20 21 22 39. **Rachelle A. Dubow** is a partner at Morgan Lewis in the Boston office. Ms. 23 Dubow graduated with a J.D. from Boston University School of law in 1998 and with a B.A. in 24 Psychology from George Washington University in 1995. Ms. Dubow represents clients in a 25 wide variety of industries that include finance, entertainment, consumer products, medical and **26** pharmaceutical products, life sciences, computer technology, and the Internet. She was named a 27 a 40 Under 40 lawyer in the East Region by *The M&A Advisor* and one of the Top Women in

Law by Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly. More details about Ms. Dubow's background and

28

| 1  | practice can be found at <a href="http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/rachelledubow">http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/rachelledubow</a> . A summary of the |
|----|---|
| 2  | time Ms. Dubow spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 hereto.  |
| 3  | Ms. Dubow's hourly rates were as follows:   |
| 4  |   |
| 5  |   |
| 6  | 40. <b>Frank Hinman</b> is a partner at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. Mr.   |
| 7  | Hinman graduated with a J.D. from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in  |
| 8  | 1991 and with a B.A. in Economics from Claremont McKenna College in 1988. Mr. Hinman  |
| 9  | leads Morgan Lewis's California antitrust practice. He represents clients in all aspects of public  |
| 10 | and private enforcement, including international cartel cases, class actions, merger clearances,  |
| 11 | and civil conduct investigations. Among other awards, Mr. Hinman has been named as a  |
| 12 | Northern California Super Lawyer and recognized by Chambers USA. More details about Mr.   |
| 13 | Hinman's background and practice can be found at  |
| 14 | http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/frankhinman. A summary of the time Mr. Hinman spent on  |
| 15 | this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Hinman's  |
| 16 | hourly rates was as follows:  |
| 17 |   |
| 18 | Holly House is a former partner at Bingham in the San Francisco office. Ms.   |
| 19 | House graduated with a J.D. from Harvard law School in 1988 and with a B.A. from Smith  |
| 20 | College in 1984. Ms. House was named one of the Top 250 Women Litigators in the U.S. by   |
| 21 | Benchmark and recognized as a top antitrust attorney by Chambers. A summary of the time Ms.   |
| 22 | House spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto.  |
| 23 | Ms. House's hourly rates were as follows:   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |
| 26 | 42. <b>Gary Adler</b> is a partner at Morgan Lewis in the New York office. Mr. Adler  |
| 27 | graduated with a J.D. Mr. Adler focuses on commercial litigation and represents both domestic   |
| 28 | and foreign companies in complex commercial law suits involving, antitrust, intellectual  |

| 1  | property, commercial tort, product liability, product warranty, and franchise claims in   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 2  | proceedings before state and federal courts throughout the United States, and before both   |   |
| 3  | domestic and international regulatory agencies and commercial arbitration panels. More details  |   |
| 4  | about Mr. Adler's background and practice can be found at   |   |
| 5  | http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/garyadler. A summary of the time Mr. Adler spent on this  |   |
| 6  | matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Adler's hourly   |   |
| 7  | rate was as follows:  |   |
| 8  |   |   |
| 9  | 43. <b>Nitin Jindal</b> is an associate at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. He   |   |
| 10 | graduated magna cum laude with a J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center in 2008 and   |   |
| 11 | with a B.A. in Legal Studies from the University of California Berkeley in 2003. From 2013 to   |   |
| 12 | 2015, Mr. Jindal was recognized as a Rising Star in intellectual property litigation by Super   |   |
| 13 | Lawyers. Mr. Jindal's representations have included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. and  | l |
| 14 | In re Intel Corp. Microprocessor Litigation. More details about Mr. Jindal's background and   |   |
| 15 | practice can be found at <a href="http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/nitinjindal">http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/nitinjindal</a> . Mr. Jindal began working | ) |
| 16 | on this case in 2011. A summary of the time Mr. Jindal spent on this matter and the value of that   |   |
| 17 | work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Jindal's hourly rates were as follows:  |   |
| 18 |   |   |
| 19 |   |   |
| 20 |   |   |
| 21 |   |   |
| 22 |   |   |
| 23 |   |   |
| 24 |   |   |
| 25 | 44. <b>Chad Russell</b> is a former counsel at Bingham and then Morgan Lewis from 2006  |   |
| 26 | to 2015. He graduated with a J.D. from Georgetown University Law Center in 2006 and with a  |   |
| 27 | B.S. in Economics and Math from the College of William and Mary in 2001. Prior to this case,  |   |
| 28 | Mr. Russell's representations included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. Mr. Russell   |   |

| 1  | began working on this case in 2008. A summary of the time Mr. Russell spent on this matter and  |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2  | the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 hereto. Mr. Russell's hourly rates were as     |  |  |
| 3  | follows:  |  |  |
| 4  |   |  |  |
| 5  |   |  |  |
| 6  |   |  |  |
| 7  |   |  |  |
| 8  |   |  |  |
| 9  |   |  |  |
| 10 | 45. <b>Marjory Gentry</b> is a former associate at Bingham from 2009 to 2013 in the San         |  |  |
| 11 | Francisco office. She graduated with a J.D. from the University of California, Los Angeles      |  |  |
| 12 | School of Law in 2005 and with a B.S. from Queen's University in 1998. Ms. Gentry began         |  |  |
| 13 | working on this case in 2011. A summary of the time Ms. Gentry spent on this matter and the     |  |  |
| 14 | value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Gentry's hourly rates were as |  |  |
| 15 | follows:  |  |  |
| 16 |   |  |  |
| 17 |   |  |  |
| 18 | 46. <b>Kyle Zipes</b> is a former associate at Bingham from 2007 to 2014 in the San             |  |  |
| 19 | Francisco office. He graduated with a J.D. from Columbia University School of Law in 2007       |  |  |
| 20 | and with a B.A. from McGill University in 2003. Prior to this case, Mr. Zipes's representations |  |  |
| 21 | included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. and In re Intel Corp. Microprocessor          |  |  |
| 22 | Litigation. Mr. Zipes began working on this case in 2009. A summary of the time Mr. Zipes       |  |  |
| 23 | spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr.  |  |  |
| 24 | Zipes's hourly rates were as follows:   |  |  |
| 25 |   |  |  |
| 26 |   |  |  |
| 27 |   |  |  |
| 28 |   |  |  |

| 1  |  |
|----|--|
| 2  |  |
| 3  |  |
| 4  | 47. <b>Nargues Motamed Eder</b> is an associate at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco   |
| 5  | office. She graduated with a J.D. from the University of California, Los Angeles School of Law   |
| 6  | in 2008 and with a B.S. from the University of Southern California in 2004. Ms. Eder's practice  |
| 7  | focuses on intellectual property and complex business litigation serving a wide range of clients in  |
| 8  | the technology, environment, and financial services industries. Ms. Eder's representations have  |
| 9  | included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. More details about Ms. Eder's background and   |
| 10 | practice can be found at <a href="http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/neder">http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/neder</a> . Ms. Eder began working on |
| 11 | this case in 2011. A summary of the time Ms. Eder spent on this matter and the value of that   |
| 12 | work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Eder's hourly rates were as follows:   |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 | 48. <b>Zachary Hill</b> is an associate at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. He  |
| 19 | graduated with a J.D. from Harvard Law School in 2010, a Master's degree in Philosophy from  |
| 20 | Northwestern University in 2007, and a B.A. in Philosophy from the University of Chicago in  |
| 21 | 2004. Mr. Hill's representations have included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. More   |
| 22 | details about Mr. Hill's background and practice can be found at   |
| 23 | http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/zacharyhill. Mr. Hill has been working on this case since  |
| 24 | 2011. A summary of the time Mr. Hill spent on this matter and the value of that work is  |
| 25 | contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Hill's hourly rates were as follows:   |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 |  |

| 1  |   |
|----|---|
| 2  |   |
| 3  | 49. <b>Manu Pradhan</b> is a former associate at Bingham from 2007 to 2013 in the San         |
| 4  | Francisco office. He graduated with a J.D. from New York University School of Law in 2007     |
| 5  | and with a B.A. from Swarthmore College in 2003. Mr. Pradhan began working on this case in    |
| 6  | 2009. A summary of the time Mr. Pradhan spent on this matter and the value of that work is    |
| 7  | contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Pradhan's hourly rates were as follows:           |
| 8  |   |
| 9  |   |
| 10 |   |
| 11 |   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 | 50. <b>Martha Jeong</b> is a former associate at Bingham from 2007 to 2011 in the San         |
| 14 | Francisco office. She graduated with a J.D. from Harvard Law School in 2007 and with a B.S.   |
| 15 | from Rice University in 2003. Prior to this case, Ms. Jeong's representations included Oracle |
| 16 | USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. Ms. Jeong began working on this case in 2009. A summary of  |
| 17 | the time Ms. Jeong spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2  |
| 18 | attached hereto. Mr. Jeong's hourly rates were as follows:                                    |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 | 51. <b>Thai Q. Le</b> is a former associate at Bingham and then at Morgan Lewis from          |
| 23 | 2011 to 2015 in the San Francisco office. He graduated with a J.D. from University of         |
| 24 | California, Hastings College of Law in 2009 and with a B.S. from Chapman University in        |
| 25 | 2005. Mr. Le's prior representations included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. Mr. Le |
| 26 | began working on this case in 2011. A summary of the time Mr. Le spent on this matter and the |
| 27 | value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Le's hourly rates were as   |
| 28 | follows:  |

| 1  |                  |  |
|----|------------------|--|
| 2  |                  |  |
| 3  |                  |  |
| 4  |                  |  |
| 5  | 52.              | Kevin Papay is an associate at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. He        |
| 6  | graduated with   | a J.D. from Stanford Law School in 2010 and a B.A. from Harvard College in         |
| 7  | 2007. Mr. Pap    | ay's representations have included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. More   |
| 8  | details about M  | Ir. Papay's background and practice can be found at                                |
| 9  | http://www.mo    | organlewis.com/bios/kevinpapay. Mr. Papay began working on this case in 2011.      |
| 10 | A summary of     | the time Mr. Papay spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in |
| 11 | Exhibit 2 attacl | hed hereto. Mr. Papay's hourly rates were as follows:                              |
| 12 |                  |  |
| 13 |                  |  |
| 14 |                  |  |
| 15 |                  |  |
| 16 |                  |  |
| 17 | 53.              | <b>Dhruv Kaushal</b> is a former associate at Bingham in the Boston office. He     |
| 18 | graduated with   | a J.D. from Boston University School of Law in 2009 and a B.S. from the            |
| 19 | University of N  | New Mexico in 1998. Mr. Kaushal also has a Ph.D. in Neurosciences from the         |
| 20 | University of C  | California, San Diego. Mr. Kaushal began working on this case in 2011. A           |
| 21 | summary of the   | e time Mr. Kaushal spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in |
| 22 | Exhibit 2 attacl | hed hereto. Mr. Kaushal's hourly rates were as follows:                            |
| 23 |                  |  |
| 24 | 54.              | Elizabeth M. Sartori is an associate at Morgan Lewis in the Boston office. Ms.     |
| 25 | Sartori graduat  | ed with a J.D. from Villanova University School of Law in 2008 and a B.A. from     |
| 26 | Boston College   | e in 2007. More details about Ms. Sartori's background and practice can be found   |
| 27 | at               |  |

| T  | contained i | n Ex <u>nibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Sartori 8 nourly rate was as follows:</u>         |
|----|-------------|--|
| 2  |             |  |
| 3  | 55.         | Joy Sherrod is a former associate at Bingham in the San Francisco office. Ms.          |
| 4  | Sherrod gra | aduated with a J.D. from Northwestern University in 2006 and a B.A. from the           |
| 5  | University  | of California, Berkeley. Ms. Sherrod began working on this case in 2010. A             |
| 6  | summary o   | f the time Ms. Sherrod spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in |
| 7  | Exhibit 2 a | ttached hereto. Ms. Sherrod's hourly rate was as follows:                              |
| 8  |             |  |
| 9  | 56.         | Nicolette Young is an associate at Morgan Lewis in the Los Angeles office. She         |
| 10 | graduated v | with a J.D. from the University of Southern California Law School in 2011 where she    |
| 11 | was the Sei | nior Content Editor for the Southern California Law Review. She also graduated cum     |
| 12 | laude with  | a B.A. from the University of California Los Angeles in 2007. More details about       |
| 13 | Ms. Young   | 's background and practice can be found at   |
| 14 | http://www  | .morganlewis.com/bios/nicoletteyoung. Ms. Young began working on this case in          |
| 15 | 2014. A su  | immary of the time Ms. Young spent on this matter and the value of that work is        |
| 16 | contained i | n Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Young's hourly rate was as follows:                   |
| 17 |             |  |
| 18 | 57.         | <b>Shameek Ghose</b> is a former associate at Bingham in the Washington D.C. office.   |
| 19 | Mr. Ghose   | graduated with a J.D. from the University of Maryland School of Law in 2003 and a      |
| 20 | Bachelor's  | degree. from the Indiana University Bloomington in 1997. Mr. Ghose also has a          |
| 21 | Master's fr | om John Hopkins University. Mr. Ghose began working on this case in 2009. A            |
| 22 | summary o   | f the time Mr. Ghose spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in   |
| 23 | Exhibit 2 a | ttached hereto. Mr. Ghose's hourly rates were as follows:                              |
| 24 |             |  |
| 25 |             |  |
| 26 | 58.         | Spencer Wan is an associate at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. He            |
| 27 | graduated v | with a J.D. from Columbia Law School in 2013 where he was a Harlan Fiske Stone         |
| 28 | Scholar and | d a B.A. in Business Economics from the University of California Irvine in 2010.       |

1 More details about Mr. Wan's background and practice can be found at 2 http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/spencerwan. Mr. Wan began working on this case in 2014. 3 A summary of the time Mr. Wan spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in 4 Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Wan's hourly rates were as follows: 5 6 7 59. **Kirstie McCornock** is an associate at Morgan Lewis in San Francisco. She 8 graduated with a J.D. from Harvard Law School in 1993 and with a B.A. from Stanford 9 University in 1989. Ms. McCornock clerked for the Honorable A. Wallace Tashima of the U.S. 10 District Court of the Central District of California from 1993 to 1994. Ms. McCornock has 11 represented technology companies in high stakes intellectual property and antitrust litigation. 12 More details about Ms. McCornock's background and practice can be found at 13 http://www.morganlewis.com/bios/kirstiemccornock. Ms. McCornock's prior representations 14 included Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. Ms. McCornock began working on this case in 15 2010. A summary of the time Ms. McCornock spent on this matter and the value of that work is 16 contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. McCornock's hourly rates were as follows: **17** 18 19 20 21 22 60. **Erin A. Smart** is a former associate at Bingham in the San Francisco office. Ms. 23 Smart graduated with a J.D. from the University of California, Hastings College of the Law in 24 2006 and with a B.A. from Walla Walla University in 2003. Ms. Smart began working on this 25 case in 2009. A summary of the time Ms. Smart spent on this matter and the value of that work **26** is contained in Exhibit 2 hereto. Ms. Smart's hourly rate were as follows: 27 28 61. **Lisa Lee** is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. Ms. Lee has

| 1  | had over 18 ye  | ears of paralegal experience. Ms. Lee's had previously assisted attorneys on         |
|----|-----------------|--|
| 2  | Oracle USA, I   | inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. A summary of the time Ms. Lee spent on this matter and  |
| 3  | the value of th | at work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Lee's hourly rates were as    |
| 4  | follows:        |  |
| 5  |                 |  |
| 6  |                 |  |
| 7  |                 |  |
| 8  |                 |  |
| 9  |                 |  |
| 10 |                 |  |
| 11 |                 |  |
| 12 | 62.             | <b>Thomas Hilton</b> is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. Mr. |
| 13 | Hilton has had  | l over 29 years of paralegal experience. A summary of the time Mr. Hilton spent      |
| 14 | on this matter  | and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Hilton's   |
| 15 | hourly rates w  | ere as follows:  |
| 16 |                 |  |
| 17 |                 |  |
| 18 |                 |  |
| 19 | 63.             | Andrew Obach is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the San Francisco office. Mr.         |
| 20 | Obach has had   | l over 17 years of paralegal experience. Mr. Obach had previously assisted           |
| 21 | attorneys on C  | Dracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. A summary of the time Mr. Obach spent       |
| 22 | on this matter  | and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Obach's    |
| 23 | hourly rates w  | ere as follows:  |
| 24 |                 |  |
| 25 |                 |  |
| 26 |                 |  |
| 27 |                 |  |
| 28 |                 |  |

| 1  |   |
|----|---|
| 2  | 64. Wendy Riggs is a former paralegal at Bingham in the San Francisco office. A                 |
| 3  | summary of the time Ms. Riggs spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in   |
| 4  | Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Riggs's hourly rates were as follows:                            |
| 5  |   |
| 6  |   |
| 7  | 65. <b>Robin S. Goldberg</b> is a former paralegal at Bingham in the Palo Alto office. A        |
| 8  | summary of the time Ms. Goldberg spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained   |
| 9  | in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Goldberg's hourly rates were as follows:                      |
| 10 |   |
| 11 |   |
| 12 | Nathan A. Banks is a former paralegal at Bingham in the San Francisco office.                   |
| 13 | A summary of the time Mr. Banks spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in |
| 14 | Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Banks's hourly rates were as follows:                            |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 | 67. <b>Joshua Berger</b> is a former paralegal at Bingham in the San Francisco office. A        |
| 18 | summary of the time Mr. Berger spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in  |
| 19 | Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Berger's hourly rates are as follows:                            |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 | 68. <b>Charles Byers</b> is a former paralegal at Bingham in the San Francisco office. A        |
| 23 | summary of the time Mr. Byers spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in   |
| 24 | Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Byers's hourly rates were as follows:                            |
| 25 |   |
| 26 |   |
| 27 | 69. <b>Christopher Suggs</b> is a former paralegal at Bingham in the Washington D.C.            |
| 28 | office. A summary of the time Mr. Suggs spent on this matter and the value of that work is      |
|    |   |

| 1  | contained in   | Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Mr. Suggs's hourly rate was as follows:  |
|--|--|---|
| 2  |  |   |
| 3  | 70.  | Jon Shackelford is a former paralegal at Bingham in the San Francisco office. A   |
| 4  | summary of   | the time Mr. Shackelford spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained   |
| 5  | in Exhibit 2   | attached hereto. Mr. Shackelford's hourly rate was as follows:  |
| 6  |  |   |
| 7  | 71.  | Nathan Hall is a paralegal at Bingham in the New York office. A summary of  |
| 8  | the time Mr.   | Hall spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2  |
| 9  | attached here  | eto. Mr. Suggs's hourly rate was are as follows:  |
| 10   |  |   |
| 11   | 72.  | Norberto Arreola is a former paralegal at Bingham in the San Francisco office.  |
| 12   | A summary of   | of the time Mr. Arreola spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained  |
| 13   | in Exhibit 2   | attached hereto. Mr. Arreola's hourly rate was as follows:  |
| 14   |  |   |
| 15   | 72   |   |
| 15   | 73.  | <b>P. Frank Downing</b> is a former paralegal at Bingham in the San Francisco office.   |
| 15<br>16   |  | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained  |
|  | A summary of   |   |
| 16   | A summary of   | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained  |
| 16<br>17   | A summary of   | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained  |
| 16<br>17<br>18   | A summary of in Exhibit 2 at 74.   | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19                                     | A summary of the A summ | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:  Michelle S. Castaneda is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the New York office.   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                               | A summary of the A summ | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:  Michelle S. Castaneda is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the New York office.  of the time Ms. Castaneda spent on this matter and the value of that work is   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                         | A summary of the A summ | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:  Michelle S. Castaneda is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the New York office.  of the time Ms. Castaneda spent on this matter and the value of that work is   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                         | A summary of the following in Exhibit 2: 4.  74.  A summary of contained in 75.  | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:  Michelle S. Castaneda is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the New York office.  of the time Ms. Castaneda spent on this matter and the value of that work is  Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Castaneda's hourly rate was as follows:   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23             | A summary of in Exhibit 2 at 74.  A summary of contained in 75.  office. A summary of summary of the summary of | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:  Michelle S. Castaneda is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the New York office.  Of the time Ms. Castaneda spent on this matter and the value of that work is  Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Castaneda's hourly rate was as follows:  Ricky Calcao is a former contract attorney at Bingham in the San Francisco   |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24       | A summary of in Exhibit 2 at 74.  A summary of contained in 75.  office. A summary of summary of the summary of | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:  Michelle S. Castaneda is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the New York office.  of the time Ms. Castaneda spent on this matter and the value of that work is  Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Castaneda's hourly rate was as follows:  Ricky Calcao is a former contract attorney at Bingham in the San Francisco mmary of the time Mr. Calcao spent on this matter and the value of that work is |
| 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24<br>25 | A summary of in Exhibit 2 at 74.  A summary of contained in 75.  office. A summary of summary of the summary of | of the time Mr. Downing spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained attached hereto. Mr. Downing's hourly rate was as follows:  Michelle S. Castaneda is a paralegal at Morgan Lewis in the New York office.  of the time Ms. Castaneda spent on this matter and the value of that work is  Exhibit 2 attached hereto. Ms. Castaneda's hourly rate was as follows:  Ricky Calcao is a former contract attorney at Bingham in the San Francisco mmary of the time Mr. Calcao spent on this matter and the value of that work is |

| 1  | attached her  | eto. Mr. Langenbeck's hourly rates were as follows:                                   |
|----|---------------|---|
| 2  |               |   |
| 3  |               |   |
| 4  | 77.           | Caryn Bordonaro is a former contract attorney at Bingham. A summary of the            |
| 5  | time Ms. Bo   | ordonaro spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2    |
| 6  | attached her  | eto. Ms. Bordonaro's hourly rate was as follows:                                      |
| 7  |               |   |
| 8  | 78.           | Guido Gaiteri is a former contract attorney at Bingham. A summary of the time         |
| 9  | Mr. Gaiteri s | spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached    |
| 10 | hereto. Mr.   | Gaiteri's hourly rate was as follows:   |
| 11 |               |   |
| 12 | 79.           | James Wooten is a former contract attorney at Bingham. A summary of the time          |
| 13 | Mr. Wooten    | spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 hereto. Mr. |
| 14 | Wooten's ho   | ourly rate was as follows:  |
| 15 |               |   |
| 16 | 80.           | Kirk Tsai is a former contract attorney at Bingham. A summary of the time Mr.         |
| 17 | Tsai spent or | n this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto.   |
| 18 | Mr. Tsai's h  | ourly rate was as follows:  |
| 19 |               |   |
| 20 | 81.           | Natasha Song is a former contract attorney at Bingham. A summary of the time          |
| 21 | Ms. Song sp   | ent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 hereto. Ms.   |
| 22 | Song's hour   | ly rate was as follows:   |
| 23 |               |   |
| 24 | 82.           | Remedios Concepcion is a former contract attorney at Bingham. A summary of            |
| 25 | the time Mr.  | Concepcion spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2  |
| 26 | attached her  | eto. Mr. Concepcion's hourly rates were as follows:                                   |
| 27 |               |   |
| 28 | 83.           | Samik Bhattacharyya is a former contract attorney at Bingham. A summary of            |

| 1  | the time Mr.  | Bhattacharyya on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2     |
|----|---------------|---|
| 2  | attached her  | eto. Mr. Bhattacharyya's hourly rate was as follows:                                  |
| 3  |               |   |
| 4  | 84.           | Jana Kurka is a former contract attorney manager at Bingham. A summary of             |
| 5  | the time Ms.  | Kurka spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2       |
| 6  | attached her  | eto. Ms. Kurka's hourly rates were as follows:  |
| 7  |               |   |
| 8  |               |   |
| 9  |               |   |
| 10 | 85.           | Ben Quinn is a former litigation specialist at Bingham and then at Morgan Lewis.      |
| 11 | Mr. Quinn h   | ad previously assisted attorneys on Oracle USA, Inc. et al. v. SAP AG et al. A        |
| 12 | summary of    | the time Mr. Quinn spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in    |
| 13 | Exhibit 2 att | ached hereto. Mr.Ouinn's hourly rates were as follows:                                |
| 14 |               |   |
| 15 |               |   |
| 16 |               |   |
| 17 |               |   |
| 18 |               |   |
| 19 |               |   |
| 20 |               |   |
| 21 | 86.           | Greg R. Chan is a former litigation specialist at Bingham. A summary of the           |
| 22 | time Mr. Ch   | an spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached |
| 23 | hereto. Mr.   | Chan's hourly rates were as follows:  |
| 24 |               |   |
| 25 |               |   |
| 26 | 87.           | Steve MacNeill is a former litigation specialist at Bingham. A summary of the         |
| 27 | time Mr. Ma   | acNeill spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2     |
| 28 | attached her  | eto. Mr. MacNeill's hourly rates were as follows:                                     |

| 1  |               |  |
|----|---------------|--|
| 2  | 88.           | Timothy R. Garner is a litigation specialist at Morgan Lewis. A summary of the           |
| 3  | time Mr. Ga   | rner spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached  |
| 4  | hereto. Mr.   | Garner's hourly rates were as follows:   |
| 5  |               |  |
| 6  |               |  |
| 7  | 89.           | Lynne S. Palmer is a research librarian at Morgan Lewis. A summary of the                |
| 8  | time Ms. Pal  | mer spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2            |
| 9  | attached here | eto. Ms. Palmer's hourly rates were as follows:  |
| 10 |               |  |
| 11 |               |  |
| 12 |               |  |
| 13 |               |  |
| 14 |               |  |
| 15 |               |  |
| 16 | 90.           | Theresa Kim is a research librarian at Morgan Lewis. A summary of the time               |
| ۱7 | Ms. Kim spe   | ent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached hereto. |
| 18 | Ms. Kim's h   | ou <u>rly</u> rate was as follows:   |
| 19 |               |  |
| 20 | 91.           | Heather Hay Watson is a research librarian at Morgan Lewis. A summary of the             |
| 21 | time Ms. Wa   | atson spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2          |
| 22 | attached here | eto. Ms. Watson's hourly rate was as follows:  |
| 23 |               |  |
| 24 | 92.           | <b>Amber Humphreys</b> is a former research librarian at Bingham. A summary of the       |
| 25 | time Ms. Hu   | mphreys spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2        |
| 26 | attached here | eto. Ms. Humphreys's hourly rate was as follows:   |
| 27 |               |  |
| 28 | 93.           | Anna M. Dana is a former research librarian at Bingham. A summary of the                 |
|    |               |  |

| 1  | time Ms. Dar    | na spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached  |
|----|-----------------|--|
| 2  | hereto. Ms. I   | Dana's hourly rates were as follows:   |
| 3  |                 |  |
| 4  |                 |  |
| 5  |                 |  |
| 6  | 94.             | Teresa Dippery is a former research librarian at Bingham. A summary of the             |
| 7  | time Ms. Dip    | pery spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2         |
| 8  | attached here   | to. Ms. Dippery's hourly rate was as follows:  |
| 9  |                 |  |
| 10 | 95.             | Stephanie Gardner is a former research librarian at Bingham. A summary of the          |
| 11 | time Ms. Gar    | dner spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2         |
| 12 | attached here   | to. Ms. Gardner's hourly rate was as follows:  |
| 13 |                 |  |
| 14 | 96.             | Melissa Jordan is a former research librarian at Bingham. A summary of the             |
| 15 | time Ms. Joro   | dan spent on this matter and the value of that work is contained in Exhibit 2 attached |
| 16 | hereto. Ms. J   | Jordan's hourly rate was as follows:   |
| 17 |                 |  |
| 18 |                 | Additional Attorneys' Fees   |
| 19 | 97.             | As described in the Declaration of James C. Maroulis and Exhibit A thereto,            |
| 20 | Oracle was d    | irectly billed by the company H5 for its services in connection with this case. H5     |
| 21 | provided Ora    | cle with attorneys who reviewed documents produced by Rimini in this litigation        |
| 22 | and categoriz   | ed or otherwise identified them by subject matter. Oracle paid H5 a total of           |
| 23 | \$1,821,800.0   | 0 for its services on this case. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.              |
| 24 | 98.             | As described in the Maroulis declaration and Exhibit B thereto, Oracle was             |
| 25 | directly billed | d by Huron Consulting Group, Inc. ("Huron") for its services in connection with this   |
| 26 | case. Huron     | provided Oracle with attorneys who reviewed documents collected by Oracle and          |
| 27 | determined w    | which ones should be produced in this litigation. Oracle paid Huron a total of         |
| 28 | \$2,539,143.2   | 0 for its services on this case. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.              |

| 1  | 99. Oracle incurred fees through its engagement with Black Letter Discovery LLP                      |
|----|--|
| 2  | ("Black Letter"). Black Letter provided Oracle with attorneys who assisted with document             |
| 3  | review and discovery in this litigation. Oracle paid Black Letter a total of 16,080.00 for its       |
| 4  | services on this case. True and correct copies of the Black Letter invoices are attached as Exhibit  |
| 5  | 13. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.   |
| 6  | 100. Oracle incurred fees through its engagement with Barg Coffin Lewis Trapp LLP                    |
| 7  | ("Barg Coffin"). Barg Coffin provided Oracle with assistance with discovery related to third         |
| 8  | parties. Oracle paid Barg Coffin a total of 12,815.12 for its services on this case. True and        |
| 9  | correct copies of the Barg Coffin invoices are attached as Exhibit 14. These costs are               |
| 10 | summarized in Exhibit 1.   |
| 11 | Expenses   |
| 12 | In addition to attorneys' fees, Oracle incurred costs relating to this case.                         |
| 13 | Including travel, court fees, copying costs, delivery costs, database and document hosting and       |
| 14 | review costs, and expert costs, these costs totaled \$22,218,798.92. A summary of the taxable        |
| 15 | and non-taxable costs incurred by Oracle for this case is contained in Exhibit 1. The bills          |
| 16 | reflecting these costs are contained in Exhibits 3-9, 15-19 to this declaration, Exhibits to the     |
| 17 | Declaration of Kieran P. Ringgenberg, and Exhibits to the Declaration of Jim Maroulis.               |
| 18 | Bingham maintained and Morgan Lewis maintains accounting records in the                              |
| 19 | ordinary course of business in which expenses are logged at the time they are incurred. The          |
| 20 | accounting records include a record of every expense incurred during the course of this matter.      |
| 21 | The expenses charged to (and paid by) Oracle in this case are reflected in the monthly bills         |
| 22 | attached as Exhibits 3-9, 15-19 (except that payment for September 2015 remains in process).         |
| 23 | Those costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.   |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 | 103. Oracle incurred costs through its engagement with Jury Research Institute                       |
| 27 | ("JRI"). JRI provided Oracle with jury selection consultation. Oracle paid JRI a total of            |
| 28 | \$155,468.99 for its services on this case. True and correct copies of the JRI invoices are attached |

- 1 as Exhibit 15. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.
- 2 104. Oracle incurred costs through its engagement with Dr. Daniel S. Levy of
- 3 Advanced Analytics Consulting Group ("AACG"). AACG provided Oracle with expert
- 4 statistical analysis. Oracle paid AACG a total of \$554,004.88 for its services on this case. True
- 5 and correct copies of the AACG invoices are attached as Exhibit 16. These costs are
- **6** summarized in Exhibit 1.
- 7 105. Oracle incurred costs through its engagement with Elizabeth Dean of TM
- **8** Financial Forensics ("TMF"). TMF provided Oracle with expert damages analysis. Oracle paid
- 9 TMF a total of \$1,812,066.02 for its services on this case. True and correct copies of the TMF
- 10 invoices are attached as Exhibit 17. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.
- 11 106. Oracle incurred costs through its engagement with Edward Yourdon of Nodruoy,
- 12 Inc. ("Nodruoy"). Nodruoy provided Oracle with expert industry custom analysis. Oracle paid
- Nodruoy a total of \$333,037.41 for its services on this case. True and correct copies of the
- 14 Nodruoy invoices are attached as Exhibit 18. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.
- 15 Oracle incurred costs through its engagement with Dr. Randall Davis. Dr. Davis
- 16 provided Oracle with expert computer science analysis. Oracle paid Dr. Davis a total of
- \$514,152.61 for his services on this case. True and correct copies of the Dr. Davis invoices are
- 18 attached as Exhibit 19. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.
- 19 108. For any of the above-described expert invoices, redacted time entries reflect costs
- 20 Oracle is not seeking to recover.
- 21 109. Oracle also incurred costs as reflected in the Declaration of Kieran P.
- 22 Ringgenberg and accompanying exhibits. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.
- 23 110. As described in the Maroulis Declaration, Oracle was directly billed by Stroz
- 24 Friedberg, LLC ("Stroz") for its services in connection with this case. Stroz provided Oracle
- 25 with electronic document hosting and preservation services, as well as a document review and
- 26 production platform for discovery that Oracle produced and received in this case. Oracle paid
- 27 Stroz a total of \$13,029,113.59 for its services on this case. Taxable costs related to Stroz's
- 28 processing and production of Oracle's own documents are highlighted in blue in Exhibit C to the

- 1 Maroulis Declaration. These costs are summarized in Exhibit 1.
- 2 Transcripts and Documents
- 3 111. Attached as Exhibit 20 is a true and correct copy of an excerpt of the transcript of
- 4 the May 21, 2009 deposition of Seth Ravin, Rimini's Chief Executive Officer.
- 5 112. Attached as Exhibit 21 is a true and correct copy of an excerpt of the transcript of
- 6 the July 21, 2010 deposition of Mr. Ravin.
- 7 113. Attached as Exhibit 22 is a true and correct copy of Trial Stipulation Regarding
- 8 Claims for Damages and Attorney Fees in *Oracle USA*, *Inc. v. SAP AG*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 07-
- 9 CV-1658, Dkt. 961.
- 10 114. Attached as Exhibit 23 is a true and correct copy of the Trial Stipulation between
- 11 Oracle USA, Inc. and SAP AG in *Oracle USA*, *Inc. v. SAP AG*, N.D. Cal. Case No. 07-CV-1658,
- 12 Dkt. 911.
- 13 115. Attached as Exhibit 24 is a true and correct copy of the Stipulation and Order
- 14 Finding Non-Parties Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin in Civil Contempt in *Oracle USA*, *Inc. v.*
- 15 SAP AG, No. 2:09-CV-01591-KJD-GWF, Dkt. 49.
- 16. Attached as Exhibit 25 is a true and correct copy of the criminal plea agreement
- 17 between the United States of America and TomorrowNow, Inc. in *United States v.*
- 18 *TomorrowNow, Inc.* N.D. Cal. Case No. 11-CR-00642, Dkt. 13.
- 19 117. Attached as Exhibit 26 is a true and correct copy of an excerpt of the 2014
- 20 National Law Journal Billing Survey. The survey data is sorted according to the "Partner Billing
- 21 Rate High" column and data is for the firms with the highest 50 entries in that column.
- 22 118. Attached as Exhibit 27 is a true and correct copy of the list of the parties'
- attorneys, as provided on this case's docket on the District Court of Nevada's Public Access to
- 24 Court Electronic Records (PACER) website.
- 25 119. Attached as Exhibit 28 is a true and correct copy of Parties' Joint Pretrial
- 26 Statement in Oracle USA, Inc. v. SAP AG, N.D. Cal. Case No. 07-CV-1658, Dkt. 745.
- 27 120. Attached as Exhibit 29 is a true and correct excerpt from Defendant Rimini Street
- 28 Inc.'s Second Amended Responses and Objections to Plaintiffs' Third Set of Requests for

| 1  | Admissions to Defendant Rimini Street, Inc., dated January 4, 2012.                        |
|----|--|
| 2  |  |
| 3  |  |
| 4  | I declare that the foregoing is true under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United |
| 5  | States.  |
| 6  | Executed November 13, 2015 at San Francisco, California.                                   |
| 7  |  |
| 8  |  |
| 9  | /s/ Thomas S. Hixson Thomas S. Hixson  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 |  |